



3653

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

First Named  
Inventor : Gary A. Lenz

Appln. No.: 09/739,080

Filed : December 15, 2000

For : IDENTIFICATION CARD  
PERSONALIZATION DEVICE WITH  
WEB BROWSER

Docket No.: F12.12-0045

Group Art Unit: 3653

Examiner: Michael  
Butler

810  
11/1/02  
Reg.  
for  
Rec.  
1716

### RESPONSE

Box Non-Fee Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

**RECEIVED**

OCT 31 2002

**GROUP 3600**

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS PAPER IS BEING  
SENT BY U.S. MAIL, FIRST CLASS, TO THE  
ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS,  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231, THIS

21<sup>ST</sup> DAY OF October, 2002.

*[Signature]*  
PATENT ATTORNEY

This is in response to the Office Action mailed August 8, 2002 in which claims 33-36, 39 and 49 were rejected. All pending claims are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

In Section 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that new drawings will be required in the application. Applicant has since filed formal drawings for this application that are believed to satisfy the drawing requirements.

In Section 9 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 33-34, 39 and 49 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by OrdaCard (Business Wire, Inc., October 23, 1998). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's assessment of the cited reference.

The cited article discusses a new identification card production service that is provided by OrdaCard, which utilizes an internet based secured photo identification card software system developed by Clal Imaging Ltd., and an Indigo offset digital printer. [paragraph 1, lines 1-2] The software system, rather than the identification card printer, allows customers to securely transmit data over the internet, which is then used by

OrdaCard to produce the desired identification card. [paragraph 1, lines 2-5] Accordingly, the article merely discusses having a central printing station where identification card production takes place using data that is received in a secure manner over the internet. This allows OrdaCard to produce identification cards at a single location, rather than having to locate several printing stations for local identification card production. This is no different than many other businesses that utilize customer data received over the internet to provide a customized service or product.

The present invention, as described in independent claim 33, is directed to an identification card personalization device that includes a "hardware component . . .; a network adapter . . .; and a web client for subscribing to data on the network." Although such an identification card printer may prove useful to such companies as OrdaCard, nowhere in the article is there any teaching or discussion of such an identification card printer. More particularly, there is no teaching or suggestion of an identification card printer that includes "a web client for subscribing to data on the network." A web client, as is conventionally known, operates as an interface to an application running on a host on the network and subscribes to data served thereby. Thus, the web client requests data objects (e.g., images, smart card data, text, video, animation, voice, barcode information, magnetic stripe information, etc.) from the host, which sends the requested data in response thereto.

It is also clear from the article that even the software that is utilized in the business practice does not operate as the claimed "web client." This is evidenced by the fact that the software system operates as a server that "maintains the entire enrollment process at their customer cites" and utilizes "Web-UPC server software," while the customer operates as the "client" that must utilize "Web-UPC r client

software." [paragraph 2, lines 1-7] There is no mention at all of any "subscribing" to data over a network. Instead, only a discussion of the transmission of data is provided. Accordingly, even if the software system was embedded in the identification card printer used in OrdaCard's system, it would still not constitute the identification card personalization device of independent claim 33. As a result, Applicant submits that independent claim 33 is neither taught nor suggested by the cited reference and requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

With regard to claim 34, the Examiner cites line 3 of the article as disclosing "web browser subscribed to data for web client." As discussed above, Applicant understands that OrdaCard's business practice allows customers to enroll "as clients" and provides data over the internet. However, there is no teaching or suggestion that the identification card printer utilized in the system includes "a web browser, wherein the web client subscribes to the data using the web browser" as described in claim 34. Accordingly, Applicant believes that claim 34 is allowable even in view of the cited reference and requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Regarding claim 39, the Examiner cites the word "enrollment" in line 3 as disclosing "data subscription services" of an identification card personalization device. The web client of the identification card personalization device of the present invention uses the data subscription services to subscribe to data provided by remote web servers 22 or a web server 14. [page 20, line 20-23] The "enrollment" aspect of the described business practice of OrdaCard relates to the customer's ability to access data "at customer sites." Such data access cannot be construed as teaching an identification card personalization device that includes "data subscription services through which the web client subscribes to the data on the network" as described in claim 39. As a result, Applicant believes that claim 39 is allowable even

in view of the cited reference and requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Regarding claim 49, the Examiner cites line 13 of the article as disclosing the "web server for serving data." The cited section of the article merely describes the server software utilized by the service bureau. There is no teaching or suggestion in the article that the server is formed as a component of an identification card printing device as described in claim 49. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

In Section 10 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 33-34, 39 and 49 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Provost (U.S. Patent No. 6,335,799). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's assessment of the cited references. Regarding claim 33, the Examiner cites Provost as teaching "a card print mechanism (106), a network and adapter, web client" in column 5, lines 29-40. Applicant does not believe that the cited section of Provost provides any discussion of a "web client" or a "network adapter" of an identification card personalization device as described in claim 33. Clarification is respectfully requested.

Applicant believes that the cited section of Provost generally refers to FIG. 1 that shows a remote host (102), a personal computer (104), and a printer (106). A description of the printer is provided in column 5, line 59 through column 6, line 51. Nowhere in Provost is there any teaching or suggestion that the printer (106) includes "a network adapter" or "a web client for subscribing to data on the network" as described in claim 33. Furthermore, the only "client" described in Provost is a customer to the business [column 1, lines 33-34], rather than a "web client" of an identification card personalization device as described in claim 33. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully

believes that independent claim 33 is allowable even in view of the cited reference and requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Regarding claim 34, the Examiner cites column 14, lines 39-53 of Provost as describing the claimed "web browser." Applicant has reviewed the cited passage of Provost and finds no mention of a web browser and, more particularly, no mention of an identification card personalization device that includes "a web browser, wherein the web client subscribes to the data using the web browser" as described in claim 34. As a result, Applicant believes that claim 34 is allowable even in view of the cited reference and requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Regarding claim 39, the Examiner cites column 5, lines 29-40 as teaching the claimed "data subscription services." As discussed above, there is no teaching or suggestion of a "web client" in the cited reference and, hence, no teaching or suggestion of an identification card personalization device that includes "data subscription services through which the web client describes to the data on the network" as described in claim 39. As a result, Applicant submits that claim 39 is neither taught nor suggested by the cited reference and requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

With regard to claim 49, the Examiner cites column 5, lines 29-40 as disclosing the claimed "web server." Applicant has reviewed the cited passage of Provost, but is unable to ascertain any description therein, or anywhere else in Provost, of the claimed web server. More particularly, there is no mention of the printer (106) of Provost including such a "web server" as described in claim 49. As a result, Applicant believes that claim 49 is allowable even in view of the cited reference and requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

In Section 11 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 33-34 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Watanabe (U.S. Patent No. 5,717,776). Applicant

respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's assessment of the cited reference.

Regarding claim 33, the Examiner cites terminal unit (39) as being equivalent to the "web client" of claim 33. Terminal unit 39 is actually a device that is connected to the image file server (38) and is used to access data stored therein. The cited terminal unit, however, is not a component of an identification card personalization device to which claim 33 is directed. The printing device (21) of Watanabe is described at column 5, line 57 through column 6, line 24. Nowhere in Watanabe is the printing device described as including "a web client for subscribing to data on the network" as in claim 33. Accordingly, Applicant believes that claim 33 is neither taught nor suggested by the cited reference and requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Regarding claim 34, the Examiner cites column 5, lines 23-40 of Watanabe as disclosing the claimed "web browser." Applicant has reviewed the cited section and finds no teaching or suggestion of an identification card personalization device having "a web browser, wherein the web client subscribes to the data using web browser" as described in claim 34. Furthermore, there is no teaching or suggestion of print unit (21) of Watanabe as having such a web browser. Therefore, Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Regarding claim 49, the Examiner cites file server (38) of Watanabe as being equivalent to the claimed "web server." However, the file server (38) of Watanabe is not a component of an identification card personalization device, nor is there any suggestion that it could be. Accordingly, Watanabe fails to teach or suggest the identification card personalization device of claim 49. Therefore, Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

In Section 12 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 33 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by D'Entremont et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,646,388). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's assessment of the cited reference.

Regarding claim 33, the Examiner identifies image acquisition units (22) as being the equivalent to the claimed "web client." However, the cited image acquisition units (22) are not formed as components of an identification card personalization device, as described in claim 33. Furthermore, there is no suggestion in the cited reference that the acquisition units could be formed as a component of an identification card personalization device. Accordingly, Applicant believes that claim 33 is neither taught nor suggested by the cited reference and requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Next, the Examiner identifies the central image server (20) as being equivalent to the "web server" of claim 49. However, the image server (20) of the cited reference is not a component of an identification card personalization device, as described in claim 49. Additionally, there is no suggestion in the cited reference that the image server (20) could be formed as a component of an identification card personalization device. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 49 be withdrawn, since the cited reference fails to teach or suggest all of its elements.

In Section 14 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 33-36, 39 and 49 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over OrdaCard in view of Knowlton (U.S. Patent No. 5,973,692). As discussed above, Applicant believes that claim 33 is presently in condition for allowance since it is neither taught nor suggested by OrdaCard. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully believes that claims 35 and 36 are allowable since

they depend from allowable base claim 33 and request that the rejections be withdrawn.

In Section 15 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 33-36, 39 and 49 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Provost in view of Knowlton. As discussed above, Applicant believes that claim 33 is presently in condition for allowance since it contains elements that are neither taught nor suggested by Provost. Accordingly, Applicant believes that claims 35 and 36 are allowable even in view of Knowlton, since they depend from allowable base claim 33. Therefore, Applicant requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

In view of the above comments and remarks, it is believed that the present application is in condition for allowance. Consideration and favorable action is respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: 

\_\_\_\_\_  
Brian D. Kaul, Reg. No. 41,885  
Suite 1600 - International Centre  
900 Second Avenue South  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319  
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

BDK/djb